

REMARKS

Prior to this amendment, Claims 1-15 were pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 9 being independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,505,935 to Mendiola et al. (hereinafter, "Mendiola"). Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendiola. We are pleased to report that Claims 3-6 and 10-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As indicated above, Claims 9 and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1-15 are now pending, with Claims 1 and 9 as independent claims.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, this claim is not anticipated by Mendiola. At the very least, Mendiola does not teach, "in reply to a request by a buyer to buy the secondhand content...transmitting sale information for the secondhand content to the seller terminal." According to Mendiola, when a user bids for product, notifications may be issued to the user who entered the bid or to some or all of other users who have entered bids for the same product. (Mendiola, column 13, lines 51-57 and column 14, lines 49-54). However, Mendiola does not teach sending a bid notification to the seller. Therefore, Mendiola does not teach the above-quoted limitation of Claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, Mendiola does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 1 arranged or combined in the same manner as recited in the claim. Therefore, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Mendiola. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §102(e) rejection of amended independent Claim 9, this claim is not anticipated by Mendiola. As indicated above, Claim 9 has been amended to recite, "in reply to the request by the buyer to buy the secondhand content, transmitting sale information for the secondhand content to the seller terminal." Mendiola does not teach at least this limitation of

amended independent Claim 9 for at least the reasons stated above regarding independent Claim 1. Therefore, Mendiola does not teach all of the limitations of amended Claim 9 arranged or combined in the same manner as recited in the claim. Therefore, amended Claim 9 is not anticipated by Mendiola. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of amended Claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 and 10-15 are dependent claims, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above with regard to their respective independent Claims 1 and 9.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No.: 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP

333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701

Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel: (516) 228-3565

Fax: (516) 228-8475